



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/265,363 03/10/99 ARAI I 520.32696CX3

020457 LMC1/0830
ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS
SUITE 1800
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
ARLINGTON VA 22209

EXAMINER

PHAN, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2781

DATE MAILED: 08/30/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/265,363

Applicant(s)
Aral et al.

Examiner
Raymond N. Phan

Group Art Unit
2781



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 28, 1999

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☒ Claim(s) 3, 9-16, 30, 33-38, 47-50, and 54-61 is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-8, 17-27, 29, 31, 39, 41, 51, and 52 is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) 28, 32, 40, 42-46, and 53 is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☒ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: amendment filed on March 16, 2000.
2. This application has been examined. Claims 1-62 are pending. Claims 27-62 have been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 17-26, 27, 29, 31, 39, 41, 51-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawdon (US No. 5,276,458) view of Nicols (US No. 4,991,023)

In regards to claims 1, 10, 12, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25-26, 27, 29, 31, 39, 41, 51-52, Sawdon a display system comprising a communication circuit 97 for communicating with an externally connected computer (see figure 1, col. 2, lines 57-67) wherein the communication circuit is having memory 11 contains identification code for the display system (see col. 3, lines 45-60). But Sawdon do not disclose the communication control circuit comprising a comparing means for comparing a first identification information which is previously stored in the display unit and the second identification information which is previously stored in the computer and is sent from computer; and a communication permission means for permitting

communication between the computer with respect to the display control of the display unit, when the first and second identification information match as a result of the comparison by the comparing means. However Nicols discloses the communication control circuit comprising a comparing means for comparing a first identification information which is previously stored in the display unit and the second identification information which is previously stored in the computer and is sent from computer; and a communication permission means for permitting communication between the computer with respect to the display control of the display unit, when the first and second identification information match as a result of the comparison by the comparing means (see col. 1, lines 37-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Nicols et al. within the system of Sawdon because it would allow automatic adjustment of the monitor thereby eliminating the need for skilled workers to make these adjustment.

In regards to claims 2, 8, 11, and 14, Sawdon teach the claimed subject matter as discussed above except the use of first identification stored in the memory of the display unit. However Nicols discloses first identification stored in the memory (see col. 1, lines 31-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Nicols et al. within the system of Sawdon because it would allow automatic adjustment of the monitor thereby eliminating the need for skilled workers to make these adjustment..

In regards to claim 4, in addition to the rejection of claim 1, Sawdon disclose the reception permission means for permitting reception of the control command for

controlling at least a display size/position of the display unit from the computer (see col. 9, lines 6-37).

In regards to claim 5, Sawdon further disclose the control command including information for controlling a display brightness/contrast (see col. 1, lines 5-15).

In regards to claims 6-7, Sawdon further disclose the control command is generated within the computer, based upon a command inputted from an input means (i.e keyboard) connected to the computer (see col. 1, lines 1-15).

In regard to claims 18 and 20, Sawdon discloses the information is transmitted between the computer and display system via serial link (see figure 1, col. 3, lines 6-16).

In regard to claim 22 and 24, Sawdon and Nicols et al. fail to teach the identification number is recognize by the computer at start up. "Official Notice" is taken that the concept and the advantage of recognizing the identification number at the computer startup are well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to include the computer recognizing the identification number at startup to the system of Sawdon or Nicols et al. to provide the integrity of the system.

Examiner suggests the applicant(s) to carefully study the entire teachings of Sawdon. and Nicols et al. references. Examiner relies on the entire teachings of references.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 3, 9-16, 33-38, 30, 47-50, 54-61 are allowable over the prior of records.

6. Claims 28, 32, 40, 42-46, 53, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Amendment

7. Applicant's amendment and arguments with respect to claims 1-26 and new claims 27-61 have been considered but claims 1-2, 4-8, 17-26, 27, 29, 31, 39, 41, 51-52 are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 17-26, 27, 29, 31, 39, 41, 51-52 are rejected. Claims 3, 9-16, 33-38, 30, 47-50, 54-61 are allowed. Claims 28, 32, 40, 42-46, 53 are objected.

9. The prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Drake et al. (US No. 5,550,966) disclose an automated presentation capture, storage and playback system.

Numao (US No. 5,483,255) discloses a display controller for liquid crystal panel structure.


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Raymond Phan, whose telephone number is (703) 306-2756. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30AM- 4:00PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Ayaz Sheikh*, can be reached on (703) 305-9648 or via e-mail addressed to [ayza.sheikh@uspto.gov]. The fax number for this Group is (703) 308-5358.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [raymond.phan@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


Raymond Phan
Aug 26, 2000


AYAZ R. SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700